

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated July 9, 2004, claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 5,781,720 (Parker).

Claim 1 has been cancelled, without prejudice, to render the rejection of that claim moot.

Claim 2 has been amended from dependent form to independent form. Claim 2 is not anticipated by Parker. Parker does not disclose a test routine adapted to receive extracted data from a predefined region of a bitmap to perform a test procedure, where the test procedure comprises matching the extracted data with a predetermined text string. The Office Action cited to column 28, lines 30-36, as teaching the extraction of data from a predefined region of a bitmap. The cited passage states that rendering code must be tested using bitmaps, and that even applications that are heavily graphical still can avoid bitmaps for testing everything but the rendering code itself. The Office Action further cited column 27, lines 56-65, as teaching the matching of extracted data with a predetermined string. The cited column 27 passage refers to a test tool that can query a text field as to its contents and to receive an ASCII string in response to the query. Note that this cited passage refers to the querying of a *text field*. However, there is absolutely no indication whatsoever that this text field is then used to compare to data extracted from a predefined region of a bitmap.

Parker teaches bitmap difference analysis that involves the comparison of pixels of two bitmaps. Parker, 28:53-54. The analysis checks the sizes of the bitmaps – if the bitmaps are not the same size, they are considered different. Parker, 28:54-56. The color of each pixel in the two bitmaps is also compared to detect if they are different. Parker, 28:56-58. Also, Parker enables the exclusion of certain parts of a bitmap from comparison. Parker, 28:58-65. However, the bitmap difference analysis performed by Parker is *not* the same as matching extracted data from a predefined region of a bitmap to a predetermined text string. Instead, the bitmap difference analysis of Parker involves the comparison to two bitmaps, not one bitmap to a text string. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is allowable over Parker.

Claim 13 is also allowable over Parker, as Parker fails to disclose performing a test procedure using a captured value (from a predefined region of a bitmap) to a predetermined text string.

Independent claim 20 is allowable because Parker fails to disclose performing a test procedure using an extracted value from a region of a bitmap, where performing the test procedure comprises comparing the extracted value to a text string.

Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims.

With respect to claim 11, which depends indirectly from claim 2, there is no teaching of a test routine to invoke the capture routine to extract data and to perform the test procedure *after each refresh*. The Office Action cited to column 30, lines 7-14, as teaching this feature. Specifically, the Office Action identified the term “memory” mentioned in this passage. However, the presence of a memory does not teach that the test routine invokes the capture routine to extract data and perform the test procedure after each refresh.

With respect to claim 4, which depends from claim 3, there is no teaching whatsoever that the communications client comprises a Telnet client. In fact, in the rejection of claim 4, the Office Action does not even acknowledge that claim 4 recites a Telnet client.

With respect to claim 15, which depends from claim 13, Parker does not disclose the device receiving the bitmap in a Telnet session. No mention of a Telnet session is made in Parker.

Similarly, with respect to claim 23, which depends from claim 22, there is no teaching of receiving the bitmap in a Telnet session between a terminal and a system.

Appln. Serial No. 09/769,556  
Amendment Dated October 1, 2004  
Reply to Office Action Mailed July 9, 2004

In view of the foregoing, all claims are in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (MCT.0135US).

Respectfully submitted,

10-1-04  
Date

  
Dan C. Hu  
Reg. No. 40,025  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880  
713/468-8883 [fax]